

22625



IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor Garry CHINN et al

Patent App. 09/916,095


Filed 26 July 2001

For SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR BROWSING USING A LIMITED
DISPLAY DEVICE

Art Unit 2176

Examiner Tran, Q

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451



REQUEST FOR RESETTING OF TERM IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR REMAILING OF
OFFICE ACTION, IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR REVIVAL UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(a)
FOR UNAVOIDABLE ABANDONMENT, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR A FOUR MONTH
EXTENSION OF THE TERM

This application has been transferred to the undersigned
firm following the bankruptcy of the prior attorney of record.

On 15 August 2003, a Power of Attorney in this case and
in the parallel application, Ser. No. 10/022,626, were presented to
the Patent and Trademark Office (only the Power in that latter case
appears from the PAAR data base to have been entered in the file).

A copy of the Power in the present case is attached as an enclosure to a correspondence address change request filed concurrently herewith.

However, on 22 December 2004 the Office issued an Office Action which was mailed to the prior attorney of record and returned as undeliverable on 10 January 2005 as best as the undersigned can ascertain.

The undersigned was informed by Italian counsel that the correspondence in the present case was in error and that such an Office Action existed and a copy of the Action was immediately procured, a response prepared, and this communication filed.

Since neither applicants' nor the undersigned received the Office Action that was mailed, the applicants did not have the possibility of responding within the term, and therefore request resetting of the term and acceptance of the enclosed response as satisfaction of the requirement for reply to that Office Action.

To limit the cost to applicants, it is requested that the Office Action be remailed and the term for response reset accordingly.

To limit the cost to applicants, as a alternative, it is requested that the Office Action be remailed and the term for response reset accordingly.

As a possible third alternative, since it is clear that the delay in response was unavoidable, it is requested that the response be treated as acceptable under 37 CFR 1.137 as an unavoidably delayed response.

Finally, if none of the prior alternatives are acceptable, it is requested that the term for reply be extended and that the extension fee of \$1590 for response within the fourth month be applied to the Deposit Account 18-2025 of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. ROSS P.C.



By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicants

ef-
April 29, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600/Fax: (718) 601-1099
Enclosures: Power of Attorney